

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	Э.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,946		04/02/2004	Yasuaki Yatagai	4059-19	8944	
23117	7590	02/13/2006		EXA	EXAMINER	
		ERHYE, PC	BOEHLER, A	BOEHLER, ANNE MARIE M		
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			LOOK	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3611		

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/815,946	YATAGAI ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Anne Marie M. Boehler	3611			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 No.	<u>ovember 2005</u> .				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>23-48</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>35 and 48</u> is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>23-34 and 36-47</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	drawn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) 🗌 a) l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔯 Infor	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/815,946

Art Unit: 3611

1. Claims 35 and 48 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on November 21, 2005.

Page 2

2. Claims 23, 28, 29, 36, 37, 42, and 44 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,561,297 in view of Ashida (USPN 6,571,297).

The claims describe all of the claimed features except front skis, a windshield, a suspension system and crawler track. However, these features are standard on snowmobiles.

Ashida shows a snowmobile with front skis 32, track 52, engine 36 mounted at the front end of the body structure between the front suspension and track.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the snowmobile describes in the prior claims to include front skis, a track, and a windshield, as taught by Ashida, in order to complete the snowmobile structure.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kai (USPN 6,547,021) in view of Berthiaume et al. (PGPub 2002/0160671).

Kai shows a snowmobile with all of the claimed features, including a body frame, ski-runners, front suspension 98, crawler track 58, four-stroke engine 54, with an oil pan 370, and an oil tank 354 in the front engine compartment. A windshield 47 is positioned over an air intake line 240.

Kai fails to specify a dry sump oil supply system and a supercharger.

Berthiaume teaches a four-stroke drive system which can be used in a snowmobile having a dry sump oil supply system and a supercharger.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Kai system with a dry sump oil supply system and a supercharger, in order to provide extra power and an effective lubrication system. It would also have been obvious to provide a filter in the oil system in order to minimize damage caused by contaminants.

- 5. Claims 29-34 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 36-47 are allowed.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne Marie M. Boehler whose telephone number is 571-272-6641. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Monday-Thursday, and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6612. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anne Marie M Boehler Primary Examiner

2/6/06

Page 4

Art Unit 3611

amb